



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/970,968	10/03/2001	Shingo Kuramochi	JP920000250US1	2672
7590	09/12/2005			EXAMINER
Andrew Calderon, Esq. McGuire Woods, LLP 1750 Tysons Blvd. Suite 1800 McLean, VA 22102			FLEURANTIN, JEAN B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2162	
DATE MAILED: 09/12/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/970,968 Examiner JEAN B. FLEURANTIN	KURAMOCHI, SHINGO Art Unit 2162

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 23 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____


SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER

In response to applicant's argument(s), pages 11 and 18, that "the combination of Naito, Kobayashi and Inaki does not teach claims 1, 6 and 10". It is submitted that Naito fails to explicitly disclose the claimed among a plurality of objects to be managed. However, Kobayashi discloses the claimed the portable remote terminal which is selected from the host data base and a record item of the object data, creating on the portable terminal an item definition data base which defines a record attribute, an object storage data base which stores object data on a record basis correspondingly to the item definition data base, a relation definition data base which defines relation among object data stored in the object storage data base and a definition data base which defines among the respective data bases created (see Kobayashi col. 5, lines 6-40). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined teachings of Naito and Kobayashi with among a plurality of objects to be managed. Such a combination would allow the teachings of Naito and Kobayashi to improve the reliability of the system for managing objects based on position data, and to provide a system for linking data between a computer and a portable remote terminal which extracts data of a host data base on the computer into the portable remote terminal (see Kobayashi col. 2, lines 52-55). While, Naito and Kobayashi fail to explicitly disclose the claimed the position data including coordinate data comprising starting points "X" and "Y" and end points "X" and "Y" for each object to be managed. However, Inaki discloses the claimed data indicates the type of the object, it also refers as object management data, object ranges data are represented by data on the coordinates start points X and Y and data on the coordinates for the end X and Y (see Inaki, col. 4, lines 40-46). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined teachings of Naito and Kobayashi and Inaki with the position data including coordinate data comprising starting points "X" and "Y" and end points "X" and "Y" for each object to be managed. Such a combination would allow the teachings of Naito and Kobayashi and Inaki to improve the speed of the process to acquire the attribute information necessary for displaying the reset cell "area" (see Inaki, col. 12, lines 62-64). Further, see Inaki column 12, lines 46 to 64.

In response to applicant's argument, page 10, that "This rejection is respectfully traversed" the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).